

REMARKS

Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9 and 14 – 24 remain in the application and are finally rejected. Claim 24 is objected to. Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 14 and 17 – 24 are amended by this proposed amendment. Claims 1, 5 and 10 – 13 are previously canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim 24 is objected to. Responsive thereto, claim 24 is amended as suggested in the Final Office Action (Final). Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is finally rejected under 35 USC §101. Responsive thereto, claim 9 is amended as suggested in the Final. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 22 and 24 are finally rejected under 35 USC §112. Partially responsive thereto claims 18, 22 and 24 are amended herein to delete “selectively” from claims 18 and 22 and to provide a baseline for determining “higher performance.” Therefore, claims 18, 22 and 24, as amended, are believed to be definite. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 14 – 17, 19 – 21 and 23 are finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943 to Barry et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,050 to Motamed et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,434,967 to Tannenbaum. Claim 4 is finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,460 to Hohensee et al. Claims 6 – 9 are finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al. and Motamed et al. Claim 18 are finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,016,061 to Hewitt and U.S. Patent No. 6,219,151 to Manglapus. Claim 22 is finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of Manglapus. Claim 24 is finally rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of Hewitt.

Claims 6, 9, 14 and 20 are amended to recite that the RIPs pass processed data to multiple print head drivers over multiple bidirectional networks. Claims 2, 4, 7, 8 are amended to recite how the print head drivers networks are structured. This is supported in the specification by paragraphs 0028 – 32. Claims 3, 19 and 22 are amended responsive to the amendment to claims 14 and 20. No new matter is added.

Barry et al. teaches merging the outputs of the RIPs in a merge 162. Figure 1b, col. 5, lines 38 – 45. Motamed et al. teaches the RIP outputs are combined in a combiner 39. Figures 3 and 5 and col. 4, lines 49 – 52. Tannenbaum et al. teaches a graphics display system wherein rasterizer outputs are passed to frame buffers 18 where they are combined for each frame. Col. 4, lines 60 – 66. Therefore, Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum neither teach, suggest or result in the present invention as recited in claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 14, 19, 20 and 22, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 2 – 4, 7 – 9, 13, 14, 20 and 22 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Further, claims 17, 18 and 21 – 23 are amended to recite that some of the personal computers are COTS PCs. This is supported by paragraph 0009. Motamed et al. teaches either using PCs that have been modified with RIP hardware 70, 72 or a multiprocessor system sharing system memory. Figures 6 and 3, respectively, and col. 7, lines 1 – 25 and col. 6, lines 46 – 47. Therefore also, Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum neither teach, suggest or result in the present invention as recited in claims 17, 18 and 21 – 23, as amended. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 17, 18 and 21 – 23 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider and withdraw the objection to the claims, reconsider and withdraw the final rejection of claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9 and 14 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. §§103(a) and 112, and allow the application to issue.

As previously noted MPEP §706 “Rejection of Claims,” subsection III, “PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED BUT NOT CLAIMED” provides in pertinent part that

If **the examiner** is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he or she **may note** in the Office action that **certain aspects or features** of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims **may be given favorable consideration**. (emphasis added.)

The applicants continue to believe that the written description of the present application is quite different than, and not suggested by, any reference of record. Accordingly, should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-3669 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

November 15, 2010
(Date)

/Charles W. Peterson, Jr., #34,406/
Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Registration No. 34,406

Customer No. 56,989
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
12793 Thacker Hill Ct.
Suite 1B
Oak Hill, VA 20171
Telephone: (703) 481-0532
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585